



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/750,183	12/31/2003	David P. Marmaros	GOOGP017	5002
23689	7590	04/29/2008		
Jung-hua Kuo Attorney At Law PO Box 3275 Los Altos, CA 94024			EXAMINER TRUONG, CAM Y T	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2162	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			04/29/2008 PAPER	

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

### Office Action Summary

**Application No.**

10/750,183

**Applicant(s)**

MARMAROS ET AL.

**Examiner**

Cam Y T. Truong

**Art Unit**

2162

**Period for Reply** -- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 1/17/2008.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) -11 and 35-43 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) -11 and 35-43 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-8508)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

### **DETAILED ACTION**

1. Applicant's election without traverse of group I (claims 1-1, 35-44) in the reply filed on 1/17/2008 is acknowledged.

Claims 1-11 and 35-43 are pending in this Office Action.

### ***Response to Arguments***

2. Applicant's arguments filed 6/11/2007 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant argued that Hennings does not teach "receiving a search request".

Examiner respectfully disagrees. Hennings teaches a gateway might receive queries, lookup the answer in a database to provide a response (col. 5, lines 15-25). The Web browser establishes a connection to a Web server and sends an HTTP request message to the server. In response to an HTTP request message, the Web server checks for authorization, performs any requested action, and returns an HTTP response message containing an HTML document in accord with the requested action, or an error message. The returned HTML document may simply be a file stored on the Web server, or may be created dynamically using a script called in response to the HTTP request message. For instance, to retrieve a document, a Web browser may send an HTTP request message to the indicated Web server, requesting a document by reference to the URL of the document. The Web server then retrieves the document and returns it in an HTTP response message to the Web browser. If the document has hypertext links, then the user may again select one of the links to

request that a new document be retrieved and displayed. As another example, a user may fill in a form requesting a database search. In response, the Web browser will send an HTTP request message to the Web server including the name of the database to be searched, the search parameters, and the URL of the search script. The Web server calls a search program, passing in the search parameters. The program examines the parameters and attempts to answer the query, perhaps by sending the query to a database interface. When the program receives the results of the query, it constructs an HTML document that is returned to the Web server, which then sends it to the Web browser in an HTTP response message (col. 6, lines 10-30).

Applicant argued that the homepage 100 of Hennings is not search result in response to the search query.

Examiner respectfully disagrees. Hennings teaches at the time the client requests the document from the web server and the web server uploads the document to the client for rendering) by a browser 410. The browser displays the content of the document as rendered homepage 100a, which contains original "Cruises" hyperlink anchor 112, along with filled DICs 412, 414, and 416, which comprise graphical or textual content and are added in proximity to text hyperlink anchor 112. Each of these DICs respectively corresponds to the data content of

the corresponding one of DICs 400, 402, and 404 (fig. 6, col. 14, lines 10-25). The client requests are represented as search request. It's clearly that homepage 100 is generated as search result based on client requests as search query.

For example, a gateway might receive queries, lookup the answer in a database to provide a response (col. 5, lines 15-25). The Web browser establishes a connection to a Web server and sends an HTTP request message to the server. In response to an HTTP request message, the Web server checks for authorization, performs any requested action, and returns an HTTP response message containing an HTML document in accord with the requested action, or an error message. The returned HTML document may simply be a file stored on the Web server, or may be created dynamically using a script called in response to the HTTP request message. For instance, to retrieve a document, a Web browser may send an HTTP request message to the indicated Web server, requesting a document by reference to the URL of the document. The Web server then retrieves the document and returns it in an HTTP response message to the Web browser. If the document has hypertext links, then the user may again select one of the links to request that a new document be retrieved and displayed. As another example, a user may fill in a form requesting a database search. In response, the Web browser will send an HTTP request message to the Web server including the name of the database to be searched, the search parameters, and the URL of the search script. The Web server calls a search program, passing in the search parameters. The program examines the parameters and attempts to answer the

query, perhaps by sending the query to a database interface. When the program receives the results of the query, it constructs an HTML document that is returned to the Web server, which then sends it to the Web browser in an HTTP response message (col. 6, lines 10-30).

Applicant argued that homepage 100 of Hennings does not contain any instruction to navigate directly to an intro-document portion of the target document..

In response to applicant's argument, Hennings teaches each icon such as Alaska and curise as an instruction to allow a user to search on a portion of an HTML document (fig. 8).

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

3. Claims 1-4, 10, 35-37, and 43 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Hennings et al (or hereinafter "Hennings") (US 6763496).

As to claim 1, Hennings teaches the claimed limitations:

"receiving a search query from a client device" as receiving a search request from a user device (col. 6, lines 19-21, fig. 6; col. 6, lines 10-30; col. 5, lines 15-25);

"generating at least one search result in response to the search query" as displaying a homepage 100 as a result in response to a user request (fig. 2), "the search result being associated with a search result document link to a search result document" as homepage 100 associated text hyperlink anchors to another webpage 118 as a search result document. For instance, clicking on either icon 104 or text hyperlink anchor 112 will link the browser to Cruises page 118 (fig. 2, col.6, lines 47-55);

"generating an instruction corresponding to the search result" as clicking on either icon 104 or anchor 112 will link the browser to Cruises page 118 indicate the system generate an instruction corresponding to the homepage 100 (fig. 2, col. 6, lines 47-55),

"the instruction being to a document browser to display the search result on the client device, the instruction being to navigate directly to an intra-document portion within the search result document when the search result is selected by the user, the intra-document portion being related to the search query" as homepage 100 is at the top level of the content hierarchy, and there is a nested page for each of the travel categories that can be reached by either clicking one of the picture icons or one of the associated text hyperlink anchors. For instance, clicking on either icon 104 or text

hyperlink anchor 112 will link the browser to Cruises page 118, causing the Cruises page to open in the browser. The Cruises page, and the pages associated with the other travel categories (e.g., Air Travel page, Trains page, etc., are all nested at a second level of the content hierarchy. As with the homepage 100, Cruises page 118 also contains hyperlinks pointing to pages that are nested below it, including Alaska hyperlink 120, Caribbean hyperlink 122, Puerto Rico hyperlink 124, and Mexico hyperlink 126. Each of these hyperlinks can be used to locate a page at a third level of the content hierarchy (fig. 2, col. 6, lines 47-60);

“providing the search result to the user” as displaying the homepage 100 to the user (fig. 2).

As to claims 2 and 36, Hennings teaches the claimed limitation “wherein each search result includes a snippet extracted from the search result document and wherein the instruction is to navigate directly to at least a portion of the snippet within the search result document” as (fig. 2; col. 6, lines 51-67).

As to claim 3, Hennings teaches the claimed limitation “wherein at least one search result includes a plurality of snippets extracted from the search result document and wherein the instruction is to generate a plurality of frames each displaying at least a portion of at least one of the snippets within the search result document” as (fig. 2, col. 6, lines 51-67).



As to claims 4 and 37, Hennings teaches the claimed limitation "wherein the instruction is an intra-document link pointing to the intra-document portion within the search result document, the intra-document portion being related to the search query" as (col. 6, lines 51-67).

As to claims 10 and 43, Hennings teaches the claimed limitation "wherein the intra-document portion is at least one of text within the search result document, an image within the search result document, a tag identification, a tag name, a tag location in the document object model, an HTML byte offset defined in the search result document and a general offset or location definition within the search result document" as beaches of document related to travel ticket caribbean cruise as the intra-document portion is text with the search result travel ticket caribbean cruise (fig. 2).

As to claim 35, Hennings teaches the claimed limitations:

"generating at least one search result in response to receiving a search query from a user, the search result being associated with a search result document link to a search result document" s as displaying a homepage 100 as a result in response to a user request (fig. 2), homepage 100 associated text hyperlink anchors to another webpage 118 as a search result document. For instance, clicking on either icon 104 or text hyperlink anchor 112 will link the browser to Cruises page 118 (fig. 2, col.6, lines 47-55; col. 6, lines 10-30; col. 5, lines 15-25);

“generating an instruction corresponding to the search result” as (fig. 2, col. 6, lines 47-60; col. 6, lines 10-30);

“the instruction being to a document browser to display the search result on the client device; the instruction being to navigate directly to the intra-document portion within the search result document when the search result is selected by the user, the intra-document portion being related to the search query” as homepage 100 is at the top level of the content hierarchy, and there is a nested page for each of the travel categories that can be reached by either clicking one of the picture icons or one of the associated text hyperlink anchors. For instance, clicking on either icon 104 or text hyperlink anchor 112 will link the browser to Cruises page 118, causing the Cruises page to open in the browser. The Cruises page, and the pages associated with the other travel categories (e.g., Air Travel page, Trains page, etc., are all nested at a second level of the content hierarchy. As with the homepage 100, Cruises page 118 also contains hyperlinks pointing to pages that are nested below it, including Alaska hyperlink 120, Caribbean hyperlink 122, Puerto Rico hyperlink 124, and Mexico hyperlink 126. Each of these hyperlinks can be used to locate a page at a third level of the content hierarchy (fig. 2, col. 6, lines 47-60);

“providing the search result to the user” as (fig. 2).

As to claim 18, Hennings teaches the claimed limitations:

"generating at least one search result in response to a search query" as receiving a search request from a user device (col. 6, lines 19-21, fig. 6) and displaying a homepage 100 as a result in response to a user request (fig. 2),

"returning the cached search result document automatically scrolled to a portion of the cached search result document containing the snippet in response to the cached link being selected by the user" as (fig. 2).

As to claim 20, Hennings teaches the claimed limitation "wherein the cached search result document is automatically scrolled to the portion containing the snippet using a named anchor defined in the cached search document" as using a named anchor defined in a search result (fig. 2).

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 5-7 and 38-40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hennings in view of Caronni et al (or hereinafter "Caronni") (US 2003/0154221).

As to claim 5, Hennings does not explicitly teach the claimed limitation "wherein the intra-document link contains an artificial anchor undefined in the search result document".

Caronni teaches when lookup routine determines that an entry corresponding to the entity name does not exist, it checks the system view table for an alternate file system entry. For example, if the lookup routine expands the entity name with a first uncommon string and no corresponding entry is found, the lookup routine may subsequently expand the entity name with a second uncommon string. The link S:\eng\user123\file 1.txt contains user123 as an artificial anchor; thus, the lookup routine expands the entity name with a second uncommon string for searching (fig. 4, paragraph [0030, 0037]).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Caronni's teaching of when lookup routine determines that an entry corresponding to the entity name does not exist, it checks the system view table for an alternate file system entry. For example, if the lookup routine expands the entity name with a first uncommon string and no corresponding entry is found, the lookup routine may subsequently expand the entity name with a second uncommon string. The link S:\eng\user123\file 1.txt contains user123 as an artificial anchor; thus, the lookup routine expands the entity name with a second uncommon string for searching to Hennings's system in order to allow processes to enforce different views dependent on the context that a process is in and retrieve information corresponding to the expanded sequence.

As to claim 6, Hennings does not explicitly teach the claimed limitation "wherein the artificial anchor includes a preassigned artificial anchor designator designating the anchor as artificial".

Caronni teaches when lookup routine determines that an entry corresponding to the entity name does not exist, it checks the system view table for an alternate file system entry. For example, if the lookup routine expands the entity name with a first uncommon string and no corresponding entry is found, the lookup routine may subsequently expand the entity name with a second uncommon string. The link S:\eng\user123\file 1.txt contains user123 as an artificial anchor; thus, the lookup routine expands the entity name with a second uncommon string for searching. S:\eng\ is represented as artificial anchor designator (fig. 4, paragraph [0030, 0037]).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Caronni's teaching of when lookup routine determines that an entry corresponding to the entity name does not exist, it checks the system view table for an alternate file system entry. For example, if the lookup routine expands the entity name with a first uncommon string and no corresponding entry is found, the lookup routine may subsequently expand the entity name with a second uncommon string. The link S:\eng\user123\file 1.txt contains user123 as an artificial anchor; thus, the lookup routine expands the entity name with a second uncommon string for searching to Hennings's system in order to allow processes to enforce different views dependent on the context that a process is in and retrieve information corresponding to the expanded sequence.

As to claim 7, Hennings does not explicitly teach the claimed limitation "wherein the artificial anchor includes the preassigned artificial anchor designator as one of a prefix and a suffix and wherein the preassigned artificial anchor designator includes a preassigned set of text characters".

Caronni teaches S:\eng\ as prefix. This prefix includes a set of character such as user123\file1.txt or user342\file1.txt . The S:\eng\ as anchor designator (fig. 4).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Caronni's teaching of \eng\ as prefix. This prefix includes a set of character such as user123\file1.txt or user342\file1.txt to Hennings's system in order to allow processes to enforce different views dependent on the context that a process is in and retrieve information corresponding to the expanded sequence.

Claim 38 is rejected under the same reason as discussed in claim 5.

Claim 39 is rejected under the same reason as discussed in claim 6.

Claim 40 is rejected under the same reason as discussed in claim 40.

7. Claims 8-9 and 41-42 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hennings in view of Hill et al (or hereinafter "Hill") (US 2004/0024788).

As to claim 8, Hennings does not explicitly teach the claimed limitation "wherein the intra-document link points to an anchor at the intra-document portion, the anchor being defined in the search result document".

Hill teaches Plant-Models List 20 gives a user a list of models of machines in the plant. Model 24 is a gateway that would list all of the units in the plant that are of the requested. The above information shows that the Plant-Model list 20 as a link to Model 24 as an anchor at the unit in the plant (paragraphs [0052, 0091]).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Hill's teaching to Henning's system in order to organize web pages of documents in hierarchy manner from a broad entity to a more specific entity so that a user can easily view modify a portion of a document easily and identify associations between documents within web pages.

As to claim 9, Hennings does not explicitly teach the claimed limitation "determining whether the search result document link references an anchor defined in the search result document; and stripping the reference to the anchor from the search result document link if the search result document link references the anchor".

Hill teaches Plant-Models list page 20 contains a link back to parent Model page 24. It means that when a user want to back to parent Model page 24, the user select a link back in Plant-Model list page 20 and the system will strip the link to the parent Model page 24 as anchor (paragraph [0091]).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Hill's teaching of Plant-Models list page 20 contains a link back to parent Model page 24 to Henning's system in order to organize web pages of documents in hierarchy manner from a broad entity to a more specific entity so that a

user can easily view modify a portion of a document easily and identify associations between documents within web pages.

Claim 41 is rejected under the same reason as discussed in claim 8.

Claim 42 is rejected under the same reason as discussed in claim 9.

8. Claims 11 and 44 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hennings in view of Shanny (US 20040158617).

As to claim 11, Hennings teaches the claimed limitation "wherein the providing the search result to the user includes providing a search result page" as (fig. 2).

Hennings does not explicitly teach the claimed limitation "wherein the instruction is at least one of a hidden tag and an attribute on a tag in the search result page".

Shanny teaches hidden tag (paragraph [0041]).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time invention was made to apply Shanny's teaching of hidden tag to Hennings's system in order to allow transmission of all the input data as result data when instructions for submit are made and further to detect page load abandons in real time.

Claim 44 is rejected under the same reason as discussed in claim 11.

9. Claims 11 and 44 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hennings in view of Streble (US 6973492).



As to claim 11, Hennings teaches the claimed limitation "wherein the providing the search result to the user includes providing a search result page" as (fig. 2).

Hennings does not explicitly teach the claimed limitation "wherein the instruction is at least one of a hidden tag and an attribute on a tag in the search result page".

Streble teaches tag with a hidden attribute (col. 4, lines 56-60).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time invention was made to apply Streble's teaching of tag with a hidden attribute to Hennings's system in order to allow transmission of all the input data as result data when instructions for submit are made and further to detect page load abandons in real time.

Claim 44 is rejected under the same reason as discussed in claim 11.

### ***Conclusion***

13. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the

Art Unit: 2162

shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

### ***Contact Information***

14. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Cam Y T. Truong whose telephone number is (571) 272-4042. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Breene can be reached on (571) 272-4107. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2162

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Cam Y Truong/  
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2162